



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/563,370

05/26/2006

Massimo Brusarosco

07040.0244

4087

22852

7590

06/23/2009

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER  
LLP

901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

TO, TUAN C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3663

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/23/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/563,370	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BRUSAROSCO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> TUAN C. TO	<b>Art Unit</b> 3663	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 February 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 48-94 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 67-94 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 48-59 and 62-65 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 60 and 61 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02/4/2009 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

In response to applicant's communication dated on 05/7/2009 regarding the last Office action, the following corrective action is taken. The period for reply of 3 MONTHS set in said Office action is restarted to begin with the mailing date of this letter.

A corrected copy of the last Office action is enclosed.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Art Unit: 3663

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 48-59, and 62-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson (US 20030058118A1) and in view of Frey et al. (US 5749984A).

As to claims 48 and 62, Wilson teaches a vehicle and vehicle tire monitoring system/method for determining the load-induced deflection or deformation of a vehicle tire based on deflection-related information such as tire load, etc.

Wilson teaches the act of acquiring a first signal comprising a first signal portion representative of a radial deformation. For example, in the abstract, Wilson teaches that the tire deflection region is detected by sensing the acceleration of the rotating tire by means of accelerometer mounted on the inner surface of the tire.

Wilson further teaches measuring an amplitude of the radial deformation in the first signal portion (see figure 5, peak to peak acceleration is representative of amplitude of the radial deformation);

Wilson further teaches that the first signal portion is representative of the radial deformation to which a first tread area portion of the tire is subjected during passage of the first tread area portion through a contact region between the tire and the rolling surface (see figure 2; and abstract); and deriving the load exerted on the tire from the amplitude (see abstract).

Wilson merely fails to disclose the steps of “estimating a rotation speed of the tire corresponding to the radial deformation, estimating an inflation pressure of the tire

Art Unit: 3663

corresponding to the radial deformation, and deriving the load exerted on the tire from the rotation speed and inflation pressure.

Frey et al discloses another tire monitoring system comprising the steps of estimating a rotation speed of the tire corresponding to the radial deformation. For example, in the abstract, Frey et al. teaches that sensor electrical signals are digitized and counted to determine deflection, tire speed and number or tire revolution; estimating an inflation pressure of the tire corresponding to the radial deformation (see column 3, lines 56-65), and deriving the load exerted on the tire from the rotation speed and inflation pressure (see column 5, lines 64-67 to column 6, lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the vehicle tire monitoring system/method as taught by Wilson by substituting the teaching of the tire vehicle monitoring system/method as taught by Frey et al. in order to enhance a vehicle tire monitoring system that has capability of controlling the length of the contact area between the tread surface of the tire and the ground surface so that the tire has optimum performance.

As to claim 49, Wilson discloses the first signal comprises a radial acceleration signal (see abstract).

As to claim 50, Wilson further teaches measuring a difference between a maximum value of the first signal in the first signal portion and a minimum value of the first signal in the first signal portion (see figure 5, the peak to peak acceleration is a measurement of the maximum value of the first signal and the minimum value of the first signal in the first signal portion).

Art Unit: 3663

As to claims 51, 56, and 57, Wilson further discloses low-pass filtering the first signal before measuring the amplitude of the radial deformation (see figure 10, the low pass filter 108 measure the accelerometer signal before measuring peak to peak acceleration value).

As to claim 52, Wilson further discloses measuring an average value of the first signal in a second signal portion; wherein a time period associated with the second signal portion does not overlap a time period associated with the first signal portion (see figure 5).

As to claim 53, Frey et al discloses the step of determining the rotation speed of the tire comprising measuring an average value of the first signal corresponding to an entire revolution of the tire (see abstract).

As to claims 54, and 55, Wilson discloses another step of acquiring a second signal representative of a radial acceleration to which a second tread area portion of the tyre is subjected (see figure 5).

As to claim 58 and 59, Wilson discloses the step of providing characteristic functions describing an expected radial-deformation amplitude versus rotation speed that correspond to predetermined conditions of load exerted on the tyre and inflation pressure (see figure 4).

As to claims 63-66, Wilson additionally discloses a brake control system, a steering control system, and suspension control system, and active roll control system (see paragraphs 0065).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 60 and 61 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The examiner has found none of the cited prior art, neither alone nor in combination, fairly suggests the limitation as recited in claim 60.

***Response to Arguments***

The applicant argues in his response that neither Wilson nor Frey discloses "acquiring a first signal comprising a first signal portion representative of a radial deformation; measuring an amplitude of the radial deformation in the first signal portion;...and deriving the load exerted on the tyre from the amplitude, rotation speed, and inflation pressure...".

In contrast, the examiner has discovered Wilson discloses a vehicle and vehicle tire monitoring system/method for determining the load-induced deflection or deformation of a vehicle tire based on deflection-related information such as tire load, etc.

In Wilson, the tire deflection region is detected by sensing the acceleration of the rotating tire by the accelerometer mounted on the inner surface of the tire. Wilson teaches that the act of measuring an amplitude of the radial deformation in the first signal portion. Wilson further illustrates in figure 5 the peak to peak acceleration as the amplitude of the radial deformation.

Wilson merely fails to disclose the steps of “estimating a rotation speed of the tire corresponding to the radial deformation, estimating an inflation pressure of the tire corresponding to the radial deformation, and deriving the load exerted on the tire from the rotation speed and inflation pressure”.

The secondary reference to Frey et al discloses another tire monitoring system comprising the steps of estimating a rotation speed of the tire corresponding to the radial deformation. For example, in the abstract, Frey et al. teaches that sensor electrical signals are digitized and counted to determine deflection, tire speed and number or tire revolution; estimating an inflation pressure of the tire corresponding to the radial deformation (see column 3, lines 56-65), and deriving the load exerted on the tire from the rotation speed and inflation pressure (see column 5, lines 64-67 to column 6, lines 1-5).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the vehicle tire monitoring system/method as taught by Wilson is modified by substituting the teaching of the tire vehicle monitoring system/method as taught by Frey et al. for the purpose of enhancing a vehicle tire monitoring system that has capability of controlling the length of



Art Unit: 3663

the contact area between the tread surface of the tire and the ground surface so that the tire has optimum performance.

### ***Conclusions***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan C To whose telephone number is (571) 272-6985. The examiner can normally be reached on from 8:00AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Keith can be reached on 571-272-6878.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3663

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Tuan C To/

Primary Examiner of Art Unit 3663/3600

June 22, 2009